

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 28, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 4-5 and 7 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. New claims 28-36 are added. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 4-12 and 28-36 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2002/0036983 to Widegren et al. (Widegren). Applicants submit that Widegren fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in any of the pending claims.

Claim 1, from which claims 4-12 depend, is directed to a method that includes receiving a policy request message at a first network node storing subscriber specific information which comprise policy information required for the session to be established. The method also includes processing the policy request message to generate a policy decision message in the first network node, and forwarding a policy request message from the first network node to at least one second network node storing subscriber specific information which comprise policy information required for a session to be established. The method further includes processing the policy request message to generate a policy decision message in the at least one second network node and sending the policy decision message to the first network node from the at least one second network node having received the policy request message, generating a single policy

decision confirmation message based on the received policy decision messages in the first network node, and sending the single policy decision message.

Claim 28, from which claims 29-31 depend, recites an apparatus that includes a memory configured to store subscriber specific information comprising policy information required for a session to be established. The apparatus also includes a receiver configured to receive a session establishing policy request message, and a processor configured to process the policy request message and to generate a policy decision. The receiver is further configured to send a policy request message and to receive a policy decision message in response to the sent policy request message. The apparatus further includes a generator configured to generate a single policy decision confirmation message based on the received policy decision messages and the policy decision generated by processor, and to send the single policy decision message.

Claim 32, from which claims 33-35 depend, recites a method that includes receiving a policy request message at a first network node storing subscriber specific information comprising policy information required for a session to be established. The method further includes processing the policy request message to generate a policy decision message in the first network node, sending a policy request message receiving a policy decision message in response to the sent policy request message. The method also includes generating a single policy decision confirmation message based on the received policy decision messages and the generated policy decision.

Claim 36 recites an apparatus that includes storing means for storing subscriber specific information comprising policy information required for a session to be

established. The apparatus also includes receiving means for receiving a policy request message, processing means for processing the policy request message and to generate a policy decision, sending means for sending the policy request message, and receiving means for receiving a policy decision message in response to the sent policy request message. The apparatus further includes generating means for generating a single policy decision message based on the received policy decision messages and the policy decision generated by processor, and sending means for sending the single policy decision message.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims recites features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in Widegren.

Widegren is directed to a method of filtering and gating data flow in a QoS connection between a remote host and user equipment in a packet data network. A corresponding policy control function (PCF) in a policy server receives from the application server, filtering data derived from session data received by the application server during the session. The GGSN interrogates the corresponding PCF in the policy server to initialize a gate usage policy to control the filtering of data at the GGSN (See paragraphs [0131]-[0133] of Widegren). The gate then filters the data flow in the QoS connection according to the policy control function for filtering data.

Applicants disagree with the interpretation of Widegren disclosed in the Office Action. The rejection of the claims refers to the same passages of Widegren as in the first Office Action. Applicants do not agree that paragraphs [0101] and [0128]-[0131] of Widegren disclose that a “single policy decision confirmation message” is generated

based on the received policy decision message in the first network node, as recited, in part, in claim 1 (emphasis added). Widegren does not describe that the GGSN (or any other entity) generates a single policy decision confirmation message. In Widegren, after the GGSN accepts or rejects the bearer establishment, the GGSN does not generate a single policy decision confirmation message.

Referring to the “Responses to Remarks” portion of the Office Action, the Office Action alleged that paragraphs [0142], [0157] and [0160] of Widegren provides support for generating a single policy decision confirmation message. Applicants disagree and submit that paragraph [0142] describes a COPS protocol client (EP), which is an enforcement point, as described in paragraph [0085], that requests policy information from a PCF. Alternatively, policy decisions made by the PCF can be pushed to the COPS client (EP). The policy decisions are stored in the COPS client in a local policy decision point accessible by the EP to perform admission control decisions without requiring additional interaction with the PCF. Paragraph [0157] is directed to similar subject matter with regard to paragraph [0142]. As for paragraph [0160], the subject matter is directed to a pull or push model that is used for the connection.

All of the subject matter disclosed in paragraphs [0142], [0157] and [0160] describe how a policy enforcement point (EP) collects a plurality of policy decisions to provide subsequent admission control decisions to be determined independently of the PCF. In other words, Widegren uses a different approach to handle policy decisions than what is disclosed in the subject matter recited in the claims. For instance, Widegren discloses that policy information is collected in the EP. Contrary to Widegren, the

subject matter of claim 1 recites, in part, “generating a **single** policy decision confirmation message based on the received policy decision **messages** in the first network.” Claim 1 clearly recites that a plurality of policy decisions are combined in a single policy confirmation message, whereas Widegren discloses a different way to handle policy decisions that does not implement a single policy confirmation message based on a plurality of policy messages.

Notwithstanding the above noted deficiencies of Widegren with respect to claim 1, Widegren is also silent regarding “forwarding a policy request message from the first network node to at least one second network node...processing the policy request message...and sending the policy decision message to the first network node from the at least one second network node having received the policy request message.” There is no teaching that any of the nodes of Widegren that operate with PCF features may contact another node handling PCF features to combine policy decisions into one single policy decision message. Widegren simply does not disclose that there might be a plurality of network nodes on the same level which carry out policy decisions. Widegren clearly only provides a single PCF node (see paragraph [0140] of Widegren).

Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, Widegren fails to teach all of the subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 28, 32 and 36. By virtue of dependency claims 4-12, 29-31 and 33-35 are also allowable over Widegren. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-12 is kindly requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1, 4-12 and 28-36 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in Widegren. Accordingly, it is

respectfully requested that each of claims 1, 4-12 and 28-36 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kamran Emdadi  
Registration No. 58,823

**Customer No. 32294**  
**SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP**  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

KE/cqc

Enclosures: RCE Transmittal  
Petition for Extension of Time  
Additional Claims Transmittal  
Check No. 018443